## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

MARTHA R. CUNNINGHAM,		§	
		§	
	Plaintiff,	§	
<b>v.</b>		§	CIVIL ACTION NO.
		§	
WALGREEN CO.,		§	SA-07-CV-0769 NN
		§	
	Defendant.	§	

## **ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS**

This order denies defendant Walgreen's motion to dismiss.<sup>1</sup> Walgreen's filed its motion on January 7, 2008 and asked the court to dismiss Cunningham's claims for want of prosecution. In the motion, Walgreen complained that Cunningham failed to answer its interrogatories and failed to respond to its requests for production. Because I was uncertain about whether Cunningham understood the consequences of not responding, I instructed Cunningham about the necessity of responding and extended the time for a response.<sup>2</sup>

Since that time, Cunningham responded to Walgreen's motion.<sup>3</sup> Cunningham filed what appears to be her answers to Walgreen's interrogatories and documents responsive to Walgreen's request for production.<sup>4</sup> The response, however, does not indicate whether Cunningham served a copy of her response on Walgreen's attorney. Nevertheless, the response indicates that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Docket entry # 19.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Docket entry # 20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Docket entry # 25.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>See exhibits to docket entry # 25.

Cunningham intends to prosecute her case, so dismissal on failure-to-prosecute grounds is inappropriate. I DENY Walgreen's motion to dismiss (docket entry # 19). I ORDER Cunningham to serve a copy of her response by March 12, 2008 on Walgreen's attorney, if she has not already done so. This deadline will permit Walgreen to obtain the Cunningham documents in sufficient time to file a dispositive motion.<sup>5</sup>

SIGNED on March 6, 2008.

NANCY STEIN NOWAK

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Mancy Steen Monak

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>The deadline for filing dispositive motions is April 7, 2008. *See* docket entry # 11.